



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/783,850	02/20/2004	William D. Johnson	P-6238-04-04	7659
23983	7590	01/26/2006	EXAMINER	
MILLS LAW FIRM, PLLC P.O BOX 1245 Cary, NC 27512-1245			BARNEY, SETH E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3752	

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/783,850	Applicant(s) JOHNSON, WILLIAM D.	
	Examiner Seth Barney	Art Unit 3752	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-10 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2, 3, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,533,676 to Conley in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0084552 to Huartson.

Regarding claim 2, Conley discloses a vehicle spraying device having:

- a drive unit including an engine (12) operatively connected to a pair of laterally spaced manually steerable drive wheels (20).
- a fluid reservoir (14) for liquid media.
- pump (44) means for delivering the liquid media to liquid delivery line (52). See Figure 1.

- control means (48) for the liquid delivery lines carried by the drive unit, the control means being manually operative to selectively deliver the liquid media to the nozzle means

Conley does not disclose nozzle means including a first set of laterally spaced nozzles carried on the frame means with the outermost being within the forward lateral vision of the operator. Conley does expressly states that the vehicle spraying device can be converted to walk-behind apparatus. See column 4 lines 1-9. Huartson

Art Unit: 3752

discloses a walk behind sprayer having a frame (36) mounted on the front of the walk behind sprayer in the forward lateral vision of the operator. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to re-position the spray nozzles of Conley as taught by Huartson when converting the spray device of Conley into a walk behind sprayer in order to avoid having the nozzles spray directly on the operator.

Regarding claim 3, Conley discloses a pair of lateral spray arms extending laterally outwards from the sides of the frame and include nozzles (54) thereon. See Figure 3.

Regarding claim 4, the control means are operative to selectively fluidly connect the sets of nozzles to the pump means. See column 3 lines 50 to 52.

Regarding claim 13, the tank means is cylindrical. See Figure 1.

3. Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,533,676 to Conley and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0084552 to Huartson as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,422,483 to Yocom et al.

Regarding claim 5, Conley discloses all of the limitations of the claims except for the spray arms being pivotally connected to the frame means for movement about a horizontal longitudinal axis between a horizontal position and a vertical position. Yocom shows this orientation in Figure 8. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the pivotal booms of Conley with the pivotal orientation of Yocom in order to make the device more compact.

Regarding claim 6, Conley discloses all of the limitation set forth in the claim except for hinge means. Conley discloses pivotable booms, but does not expressly disclose that they have hinges with biased springs. Yocom discloses a liquid spraying tractor having a boom with hinges that are spring biased (88). See column 4, lines 51 to 54 and Figures 2A-2B, 7 and 8. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the vehicle spraying device of Conley with the hinge means and spring of Yocom in order to easily pivot the boom for storage and passage into smaller areas, while simultaneously allowing the boom to easily return to the other position by the spring bias.

Regarding claim 7, Conley does not disclose support means carried on the side of the frame for releasably maintaining the spray arms. Yocom discloses support means (110,112) attached to the frame for supporting the boom arms in position during operation. See column 4, lines 62 to 65. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the vehicle spraying device of Conley with the supports of Yocom in order to retain the boom arms in position during operation.

Regarding claim 8, the control means can be set in a first conditions such all flow is blocked to all nozzles (off or to the hand sprayer), a second condition where a first set of nozzles receives flow, and a third condition in which a second set of nozzles receive flow. See column 3 lines 50 to 60.

Regarding claim 9, if all of the valves (48) and spray gun (46) were closed, the liquid flow would travel in a recirculation path between the pump (44) and the reservoir as shown in Figure 3.

4. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,533,676 to Conley, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0084552 to Huartson, and U.S. Patent No. 6,422,483 to Yocom et al. as applied to claims 2-9 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,771 to Wyne.

While Conley does disclose that the spraying device may be a walk-behind device, he does not expressly disclose that it is a zero turn radius walk-behind device. Wyne discloses a typical spraying device that can be walk-behind and has a zero-turn radius. See column 4 lines 48 to 67. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the walk-behind spraying device of Conley with the zero turn radius structure of Wyne in order to provide a highly desirable control feature. See column 2 lines 64 to 67.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claim 1 is allowed.

6. Claims 11 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments, see page 7 and 8, filed November 23, 2005, with respect to claims 1 and 11 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of claims 1 and 11 have been withdrawn.

8. Applicant's arguments, see page 6 and 7, filed November 23, 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,533,676 to Conley have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of prior art already of record, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0084552 to Huartson. As abovementioned, Conley discloses the spray device can be converted to the walk behind type while Huartson teaches a walk behind sprayer having frontally mounted nozzles.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Seth Barney whose telephone number is (571)272-4896. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5:00pm (Mon-Fri), first Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Scherbel can be reached on (571)272-4919. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Seth Barney
Examiner
Art Unit 3752

sb



David A. Scherbel
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700